



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/415,205	10/12/1999	CHIAKI IGARASHI	Q56197	4491

7590

05/21/2002

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

CONTEE, JOY KIMBERLY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2681

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AG

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/415,205

Applicant(s)  
Igarashi

Examiner  
Joy K. Contee

Art Unit  
2681



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 12, 1999
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Oct 12, 1999 is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 9
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2681

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. Figure 4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 6 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: The preamble describes a system (or apparatus) but concludes with “the system including steps of” (see line 7) as if describing a method claim. Appropriate correction is required.
3. Claims 6 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 18 and 11, respectively, the “S” on the end of “ID” appears to be a typographical error . Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim ends with a semi-colon. Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 7, “set” appears that it should be plural. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2681

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly the claims have not been treated on the merits.

8. Claim 6 (independent claim and thus its dependents 7-9) recites the limitation "the opposite side" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sotek et al.

("Sotek"), WO 87/38370 (referring to U.S. Patent No. 6,189,059 for translated U.S. equivalent).

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claim 1, Sotek discloses a radio telephone system, in which a plurality of slave telephone sets is connected to a public telephone network through radio communication with a master telephone set, wherein:

a plurality of unit IDs are preliminary registered in each of the slave telephone sets, and the plurality of unit IDs are also registered in the master telephone set (col. 2, lines 15-23).

Regarding claim 2, Sotek discloses a radio telephone system, in which a plurality of slave telephone sets is connected to a public telephone network through radio communication with a master telephone set, wherein:

a plurality of unit IDs are preliminary registered in each of the slave telephone sets, and the plurality of unit IDs are also registered in the master telephone set and whenever each slave telephone set makes radio communication with the master telephone set, an unit ID corresponding to the radio communication is selected (col. 2, lines 15-23).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotek, in view of Nakayama, U.S. Patent No. 5,687,218.

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claim 3, Sotek disclose the radio communication system according to claim 1 or 2. Sotek does not explicitly wherein the plurality of unit IDs registered in each slave telephone set are registered in a *plurality* of master telephone sets .

In a similar field of endeavor, Nakayama discloses wherein a plurality of master telephone sets which receive ID signals from a self stations. When a call is received by either of the master units the master unit calls the slave station by using the ID signal received by the self station (col. 2, lines 54-64).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Sotek to include multiple master sets as taught by Nakayama for the purpose of allowing a plurality of lines to be received by a single slave unit.

13. Claim 4/1 and 4/2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotek, in view of Wakayama et al. ("Wakayama"), U.S. Patent No. 6,212,221.

Regarding claim 4, Sotek discloses the radio telephone system according to claim 1 or 2. Sotek does not explicitly disclose the radio telephone, wherein each slave telephone set is capable of utilizing both analog radio communication and also digital communication.

In a similar field of endeavor, Wakayama discloses the radio telephone system, wherein each slave telephone set is capable of utilizing both analog radio communication and also digital communication (col. 8, lines 49-57).

Art Unit: 2681

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Sotek to include both analog and digital communication for the purpose of communicating voice and/or data to master unit.

14. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotek and Wakayama as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Nakayama.

Regarding claim 5, Sotek discloses the radio communication system according to claim 1 or 2. Sotek does not explicitly wherein the plurality of unit IDs registered in each slave telephone set are registered in a *plurality* of master telephone sets and each slave telephone set is capable of utilizing both analog radio communication and also digital communication.

In a similar field of endeavor, Wakayama discloses the radio telephone system, wherein each slave telephone set is capable of utilizing both analog radio communication and also digital communication (col. 8, lines 49-57).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Sotek to include both analog and digital communication for the purpose of communicating voice and/or data to master unit.

In a similar field of endeavor, Nakayama discloses wherein a plurality of master telephone sets which receive ID signals from a self stations. When a call is received by either of the master units the master unit calls the slave station by using the ID signal received by the self station (col. 2, lines 54-64).

Art Unit: 2681

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Sotek to include multiple master sets as taught by Nakayama for the purpose of allowing a plurality of lines to be received by a single slave unit.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

15. Claims 10-11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the claim objections, set forth in this Office action.

16. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art of record fails to disclose wherein a plurality of unit IDs registered in each slave telephone set are registered in a plurality of master telephone sets.

*Conclusion*

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nakayama, U.S. Patent No. 5,687,218, discloses a cordless telephone.

Hachimura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,327,477, discloses a wireless communication apparatus and system.

Mizutani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,722, 054, disclose communications apparatus.



Art Unit: 2681

Hiroki, U.S. Patent No. 6,314,298, discloses a wireless communication system having a communications apparatus.

Hachiga, U.S. Patent No. 5,581,598, discloses an apparatus and method for setting an id number.

Tanaka et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,787,356, discloses a cordless telephone system and generation method of a unique word thereof.

Kamimoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,375,163, discloses a multi-channel cordless telephone system for maintaining master-slave communication.

Sakai, U.S. Patent No. 6,005,869, discloses a communication network having master station and slave stations.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joy K. Contee whose telephone number is (703) 308-0149, M-F 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

If the examiner can not be reached, the examiner's supervisor Dwayne Bost can be reached on (703)305-4778.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703)306-0377

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2681

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry or  
informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to*

*Crystal Park II*

*Sixth Floor (Receptionist)*


*2121 Crystal Drive*

*Arlington, VA*



Joy K. Contee

May 7, 2002

  
NAY MAUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER